

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the case. The Office Action rejected each of 1-38 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Letters Patent 2005/0038750 (“Cahill”). The Office Action also noted that the drawings have been accepted. The Office also indicated that the references cited in the IDS have been considered.

Applicants traverse each of the rejections. An anticipating reference, by definition, must disclose every limitation of the rejected claim in the same relationship to one another as set forth in the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Cahill fails to meet this standard with respect to each of the claims.

The present invention, in one aspect, delivers to a user less than all of an electronic mail message based on principles of digital rights management. Independent claims 1, 17, 24, and 30 have been amended to clarify this. Cahill fails to teach delivering a “reduced” electronic e-mail message—*i.e.*, one from which unauthorized content has been removed—to the user as is recited in claims 1, 17, 24, and 30. (This limitation also is incorporated into the claims depending therefrom pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4.) Cahill, on the other hand, delivers the entire content to the user, as is apparent from the fact that the authorization determination occurs on the user’s computer. This is particularly apparent from Figure 3 and ¶[0069] and ¶[0097].

In a second aspect, the present invention provides a mechanism for displaying an indication of user authorization as recited in independent claim 34. (This limitation also is incorporated into the claims depending therefrom pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4.) The Office cites ¶[0068]-¶[0070] of Cahill as teaching this limitation. The Office, in particular, quotes the following language:

Such *license rules* include the *aforementioned requirement* that the *user/user’s computing device select* to obtain from the *content owner* or an agent thereof. When user selects for such *license*, and *satisfies rules and requirements* are the provided with a trusted component mechanism that will *evaluate rules and requirements* with *license evaluator (monitoring)* and not render the digital content except according to the license rules embodied in the license associated with the digital content and obtained by the user, such as *decryption key (authorization)* for decrypting the digital content, and encrypted according to a key decryptable by the user’s computing device....

(Detailed Action, p. 16)

This is all well and good, but it has nothing to do with “providing an indication of a user authorization ...in response to detecting that at least one of the at least one indicators has been selected by the user”. The Office has therefore failed to establish that Cahill teaches this limitation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Cahill fails to anticipate any claim. Cahill more particularly fails to teach or suggest:

- “providing the selected [authorized] portion to the user in the reduced electronic mail message” as is recited in claims 1, 17, 24, and 30 and incorporated into claim 2-16, 18-23, 25-29, and 31-33; and
- “providing an indication of a user authorization ...in response to detecting that at least one of the at least one indicators has been selected by the user” as recited in claim 34 and incorporated in claims 35-38.

Cahill therefore fails to anticipate any of claims 1-38 because it fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of those claims. M.P.E.P. § 2131; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn, that the claims are in condition for allowance, and requests that they be allowed to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (713) 934-4053 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 20, 2008

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
10333 Richmond Dr., Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-7000

/Jeffrey A. Pyle/
Jeffrey A. Pyle
Reg. No. 34,904
Attorney for Applicants